

REMARKS:

In the foregoing amendments, claims 2 and 5 were amended to further define that the first shaft part of the eccentric pin provides pitch adjustment of the blade by rotating relative to the bracket on the backside of the blade, along the lines discussed on page 14, line 22, to page 15, line 12, and elsewhere in applicant's specification disclosure. Claims 7 and 8 were added to the application and define that the second shaft part includes a disk rotatably received in the bracket on the backside of the blade, which is shown, for example, at item 40b in figure 3 of the present application. After the foregoing amendments, claims 2-8 are in the application for consideration by the examiner.

The Official action set forth a prior art rejection of claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent No. 4,893,683 of Horsch *et al.* (Horsch). In the previous Office action, claims 2-4 were not rejected over prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Horsch do not disclose or suggest the invention as defined in present claims 2-8 within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103.

The prior art rejection is set forth on pages 2-4 of the Official action. In these comments, the Official action stated that element 112 of Horsch is an eccentric pin. Attention is respectfully directed to figure 14 of Horsch. As shown therein, element 112 and slide block 134 have a different structure from

the eccentric pin (40a, 40b) and bracket 48 shown in figure 3 of the present application. The structure of applicant's claimed invention permits extremely small adjustments in the pitch angle of the blade. In contrast thereto, the structure proposed by Horsch is limited to one of the four holes in the slide block member 134 for any angle adjustments. In more detail, amended independent claims 2 and 5 define that the first shaft part of the eccentric pin provides pitch adjustment of the blade by rotating relative to the bracket on the backside of the blade. The teachings of Horsch do not remotely contemplate or suggest this structure, arrangement and function. New claims 7 and 8 define that the second shaft part includes a disk rotatably received in the bracket on the backside of the blade. The teachings of Horsch do not remotely contemplate or suggest this structure, arrangement and function. At least for these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Horsch cannot disclose or suggest the invention as defined in present claims 2-8 within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider and withdraw this projection.

For the foregoing reasons, a formal allowance of claims 2-8 is respectfully requested. The foregoing is believed to be a complete and proper response to the Official action mailed December 19, 2005. While it is believed that all the claims in this application are in condition for allowance, should the examiner

have any comments or questions, it is respectfully requested that the undersigned be telephoned at the below listed number to resolve any outstanding issues.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee therefor, as well as any other fees which become due, may be charged to our deposit account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,  
POSZ LAW GROUP, PLC



R. Eugene Varndell, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 29,728

Atty. Case No. VX032577US  
12040 South Lakes Drive  
Suite 101  
Reston, Virginia 20191  
(703) 707-9110

\\Q:\2006\KOMATSU\VX032577\PO-152-2577US RS.DOC